

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Pages 21-22 have been amended to improve its readability and clarity relating to the disclosure of section (d) of Fig. 3. Independent claims 1, 4, 8, 10-12, 15, and 16 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Specifically, independent claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended to more clearly define “across” as in --spanning-- across. Independent claims 10-12, 15, and 16 have been amended to more clearly define the horizontal/vertical offset attribute information. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yanese (USP 6,235,979), and claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanese in view of Taki (USP 5,665,927). Applicants traverse these rejections at least to the extent that these references would not have taught displaying musical note symbols or marks spanning across multiple musical stave rows, as set forth in independent claims 1, 4, and 8, and varying the horizontal or vertical position of a musical score symbol on a musical score based on the designated attribute information, as set forth in independent claims 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16.

In rejecting claims 1, 4, and 8, the examiner alleged that Yanese discloses displaying musical note symbols or marks across multiple musical stave rows, relying on the passage set forth in column 2, lines 16-26. But neither this passage nor any other passage in Yanese discloses displaying musical note or score symbols “across” multiple musical stave rows, such as illustrated in Fig. 5 of the present application. The passage identified by the examiner merely discloses placing score marks “to a plurality of rows of staves.” Placing score marks to multiple rows of staves is not the same as placing “across” multiple rows of staves. In fact, the term “across” does not appear anywhere in Yanese. It appears that the examiner did not fully appreciate the meaning of “across.” In this respect, although applicants believe that claims 1, 4, and 8 define over Yanese, the claims now recite --spanning across-- for added clarity. Applicants submit that neither Yanese nor Taki discloses placing score marks spanning across multiple rows of staves (e.g., see Fig. 5 of the present application).

In rejecting independent claims 10-12, 15, and 16, the examiner argued that Yanese discloses changing the position of a note, such as by an octave or laterally based on the tempo change, relying on the passages set forth in column 7, lines 24-34, column 10, lines 39-54, column 11, lines 29-35, column 12, lines 31-40 and 44-56. These passages indeed disclose varying the position of musical notes. However, neither Yanese nor Taki would have disclosed or taught varying the note position based on any designated "attribute information," let alone the type of attribute information now defined. For clarity, independent claims 10-12, 15, and 16 now define the "attribute information" more clearly as including data identifying a type of horizontal or vertical offset and a parameter value representing an amount of the horizontal offset in a timing value or in pitch-related information, or both.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-17 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

21 JULY 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)